UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,543	09/02/2003	Charanpreet S. Bagga	OVIT-0252	3970
23377 7590 03/15/2007 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET			EXAMINER	
			PHILOGENE, PEDRO	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		3733	
				- 12
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	- DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/15/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/654,543	BAGGA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Pedro Philogene	3733			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicated if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reption. If period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT by statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	1 <u>19 December 2006</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice u	•	·			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-9 and 56-59 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-9,56-59 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration.	·			
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection	• , ,				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	,	· · ·			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doct 2. Certified copies of the priority doct 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International II * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in Ap ne priority documents have been r Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)	·	(070,440)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application 			

Application/Control Number: 10/654,543

Art Unit: 3733

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9,56-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiley et al. (7,081,122) in view of Motoda (WO 90/06150) in view of Buscemi et al. (5,500,013).

With respect to the above claims, Reiley et al disclose kit for delivery of a composition into an intraosseous space comprising at least one cannula (50) at least one stylet (23) insertable into a cannula and being movable therein, at least one catheter (130) that is insertable into the cannula; and a system (136,140,142) for delivery of aliquots of the composition into the intraosseous space via the catheter; asset forth in column 4, lines 14-25, column 7, lines 39-59, column 8, lines 35-67, column 9, lines 1-67, column 10, lines 1-14.

It is noted that Reiley et al did not teach of a catheter having a high-porosity tip; as claimed by applicant. However, in a similar art, Motoda (page 3, lines 26-27, page 4, lines 27-28) evidences the use of a catheter having a high-porosity tip to prevent damage to the interior walls of the heart or blood vessels while releasing the substance.

Therefore, given the teaching of Motoda, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the tip of the catheter of

Application/Control Number: 10/654,543 Page 3

Art Unit: 3733

Reiley et al, as taught by Motoda to prevent damage to the interior walls of the heart or blood vessels while releasing the substance.

It is also noted that the above combination of references did not teach of a tip comprising polylactic acid; as claimed by applicant. However, in a similar art, Buscemi et all evidences the use of a polylactic acid so that the material undergoes breakdown or decomposition into harmless compounds as part of a normal biological process.

Therefore, given the teaching of Buscemi et al, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use polylactic acid in the device of Reiley/Motoda so that the material undergoes breakdown or decomposition into harmless compounds as part of a normal biological process.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 12/19/06, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-9 under 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Motoda.

Motoda teach of a tip with porosity about 60% to 90%. As to the composition comprising a restorative or viscous injectable material, Reiley discloses such a material (bone cement). As to the composition comprising polymethylmethacrylate, hydrogel and replicated bone marrow, these substances are old and well known in the art, as best seen in the pertinent art cited.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/654,543

Art Unit: 3733

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7,019,192 3-2006 Gertzman et al.

6,437,018 8-2002 Gertzman et al.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro Philogene whose telephone number is (571) 272-4716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on (571) 272 - 4719. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/654,543

Art Unit: 3733

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Pedro Philogene March 07, 2007

edio Mul